



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/775,652

02/09/2004

Ravindra Bidnur

14448US01

1448

23446 7590 07/09/2008  
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD  
500 WEST MADISON STREET  
SUITE 3400  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

RASHIDIAN, MOHAMMAD M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/775,652	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BIDNUR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MEHDI RASHIDIAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **FINAL ACTION**

### **Response to Amendments/Arguments**

1. Applicant's arguments, see (pages 8-15), filed on April 09, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-18 over MacInnis et al. (US PG PUB 2003/0185306) have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Therefore, This Office Action Made Final.
2. In remarks, applicants argued in substance that, MacInnis does not teach or suggest, a host processor for providing an indication to the video decoder indicating the particular encoding standard, and wherein the video decoder executes the first set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the first encoding standard and executes the second set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the second encoding standard.
3. However, in response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner would like to point out that claim language is given its broadest reasonable interpretation. The specification is not measure of invention. Therefore, limitations contained therein cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. *Ir re Spork*, 55CCPA 743, 386 F. 2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1968). In the instant case, Examiner not only pointed to the above area also pointed that, the MacInnis clearly reads, a host processor for providing an indication to the video decoder indicating the particular encoding standard, and wherein the video decoder executes the first set of instructions if the indication indicates that the

particular encoding standard is the first encoding standard and executes the second set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the second encoding standard. Firstly, there is nothing in the claim language indicates that the video decoder, and the host processor are separate or part of each other. Secondly, MacInnis discloses several examples that indicates the decoder and the host are separate (see fig. 3) or part of each other. Also MacInnis discloses that the core processor program registers in each module to modify the operational behavior according to the coding/ decoding format (§ [0083, the last 14 lines]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by MacInnis et al. (US PGPub 2003/0185306) henceforth referred to as MacInnis.

Regarding **Claim1**, MacInnis teaches, a system for decoding video data encoded with a particular standard, said system comprising: a video decoder for decoding the video

Art Unit: 2624

data encoded with the particular standard, (figs. 1-2, abstract, ¶ [002], ...encoding/ decoding standards...),

- instruction memory for storing: a first set of instructions for decoding encoded video data according to a first encoding standard, (fig. 1, abstract, ¶ [0065] first encoding/ decoding format...),
- and a second set of instruction for decoding encoded video data according to a second encoding standard, (fig. 1, abstract, ¶ [0065] second encoding/ decoding format...),
- a host processor for providing an indication to the video decoder indicating the particular encoding standard, (fig. 3, ¶ [0044, lines 1-10], and ¶ [0040, lines 1-11], and ¶ [0030, lines 4-10], and ¶ [0031, lines 1-10] ...first decoder controls processor...), ¶ [0083, last 14 lines] system 300 of fig. 3 provides...).

- and wherein the video decoder executes the first set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the first encoding standard and executes the second set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the second encoding standard, (figs. 1-3, abstract, ...), ¶ [0011]

Regarding **Claim 2**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 1**, wherein the first encoding standard comprises MPEG-2 and the second encoding standard comprises MPEG-4, (figs. 1-3, abstract, ¶ [0026] MPEG-1, MPEG-2,...MPEG-4).

Regarding **Claim 3**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 1**, wherein the instruction memory stores a third set of instructions for decoding encoded video data according to a third encoding standard, and wherein the video decoder executes the third set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the third encoding standard, (figs. 3, abstract, ¶ [0056-0058] processor 300...).

Regarding **Claim 4**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 3**, wherein the first encoding standard comprises MPEG-2, the second encoding standard comprises MPEG-4, and the third encoding standard comprises DV-25, (figs. 6, abstract, ¶ [0083] Digital Video).

Regarding **Claim 5**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 3**, wherein the instruction memory stores a fourth set of instructions for decoding the video data in accordance with the first encoding standard, the second encoding standard, and the third encoding

standard, (figs. 6, abstract, ¶ [0083] Digital Video...).

Regarding **Claim 6**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 1**, further comprising a register for storing the indication from the host processor, (¶ [0031] each hardware module includes the status register...).

Regarding **Claim 7**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 6**, wherein the instruction memory stores a fifth set of instructions, wherein execution of the instructions by the host processor cause: detecting the particular encoding standard; and writing the indicator to the register. (¶ [0031] each hardware module includes the status register...).

Regarding **Claim 8**, MacInnis teaches, a method for decoding video data encoded with a particular standard, said method comprising: providing an indication to a video decoder indicating the particular encoding standard to the video decoder, (figs. 1-2, abstract, ¶ [002], ...encoding/ decoding standards...),

- executing a first set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is a first encoding standard, (fig. 1, abstract, ¶ [0065] first encoding/ decoding format...),
- and executing a second set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the second encoding standard, (fig. 1, abstract, ¶

[0065] second encoding/ decoding format..., ¶ [0083, last 14 lines] system 300 of fig. 3 provides...).

Regarding **Claim 9**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 8**, wherein the first encoding standard comprises MPEG-2 and the second encoding standard comprises MPEG-4, (figs. 1-3, abstract, ¶ [0026] MPEG-1, MPEG-2,...MPEG-4).

Regarding **Claim 10**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 8**, further comprising executing the third set of instructions if the indication indicates that the particular encoding standard is the third encoding standard, (figs. 3, abstract, ¶ [0056-0058] processor 300...).

Regarding **Claim 11**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 10**, wherein the first encoding standard comprises MPEG-2, the second encoding standard comprises MPEG-4, and the third encoding standard comprises DV-25, (figs. 6, abstract, ¶ [0083] Digital Video).

Regarding **Claim 12**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 10**, executing a fourth set of instructions for decoding the video data in accordance with the first encoding standard, the second encoding standard, and the third encoding standard, (figs. 6, abstract, ¶ [0083] Digital Video...).



Regarding **Claim 13**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 8**, further comprising: detecting the particular encoding standard; and writing the indicator to a register, (¶ [0031] each hardware module includes the status register...).

Regarding **Claim 14**, MacInnis teaches, a system for decoding video data encoded with a particular standard, said system comprising: a code memory for instructions; and a processor for loading the code memory with a first set of instructions for decoding encoded video data according to a first encoding standard, (figs. 1-2, abstract, ¶ [002], ...encoding/ decoding standards...),

- where the video data is encoded according to the first encoding standard and for loading the code memory a second set of instruction for decoding encoded video data according to a second encoding standard, (fig. 1, abstract, ¶ [0065] first encoding/ decoding format...),
- wherein the video data is encoded according to the second encoding standard. (fig. 1, abstract, ¶ [0065] second encoding/ decoding format..., ¶ [0083, last 14 lines] system 300 of fig. 3 provides...).

Regarding **Claim 15**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 14**, wherein the processor loads the code memory after receiving an indication from a host processor indicating the

Art Unit: 2624

particular encoding standard, (figs. 1-2, abstract, ¶ [002], ...encoding/ decoding standards...).

Regarding **Claim 16**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 14**, wherein execution of the first set of instructions by the processor controls a first plurality of circuits, and execution of the second set of instructions controls a second plurality of circuits. (figs. 1-3, abstract, ¶ [0026] MPEG-1, MPEG-2,...MPEG-4).

Regarding **Claim 17**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 14**, further comprising a slave engine, said slave engine further comprising: another instruction memory for storing a third set of instructions if the encoding standard is the second encoding standard, (figs. 3, abstract, ¶ [0056-0058] processor 300...).

Regarding **Claim 18**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 17**, wherein the slave engine comprises a third plurality of circuits, wherein the execution of the third set of instructions controls the third plurality of circuits, (figs. 3, abstract, ¶ [0056-0058] processor 300...).

Regarding **Claim 19**, MacInnis teaches, the system of **claim 1**, wherein the video decoder and the host processor are discrete component, (figs. 3, ¶ [0083 last 14 lines] in each module...).

Regarding **Claim 20**, MacInnis teaches, the method of **claim 8**, wherein the indication is provided to the video decoder discrete component, (figs. 3, ¶ [0083 last 14 lines] in each module...).

### **Conclusion**

**6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Contact information**

**7.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehdi Rashidian whose telephone number is (571) 272-9763. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thurs 9:00 AM to 8:00 PM, ET.

Art Unit: 2624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on (571) 272-7413. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mehdi Rashidian  
June 30, 2008  
/Samir A. Ahmed/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624